



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,227	02/13/2001	Scott Craig Koss	8371-123	2514
46404	7590	09/08/2005		
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. 210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
			EXAMINER SORRELL, ERON J	
			ART UNIT 2182	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/784,227

Applicant(s)

KOSS, SCOTT CRAIG

Examiner

Eron J. Sorrell

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/13/05 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,2,5,8,9,10,12,13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,217 hereinafter Lahey).

4. Referring to method claim 1 and computer-readable medium claim 9, Lahey teaches a method for network document processing, the method comprising:

a) activating an interface between a predetermined document processing device and a workstation by locating the predetermined document processing device and accessing the operational settings of the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7 and lines 35-47 of column 8, wherein Lahey teaches selecting a specific printer and designate printing attributes);

b) providing at least one user interface to a user at the workstation, wherein the interface allows the user to select the operational setting for the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

c) generating a document data file (see lines 15-31 of column 7); and

d) communicating a location of the document data file and any auxiliary information to the predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by the user (see lines 22-27 of column 6).

Art Unit: 2182

5. Referring to claim 2, Lahey teaches activating an interface further comprises launching a document processing client in response to a document processing request by the user (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

6. Referring to claim 5, Lahey teaches generating a document data file further comprises storing the document data file on a job file store (see lines 30-37 of column 12).

7. Referring to method claim 8 and system claim 17, Lahey teaches the document processing device is one of the group comprising: a printer, a fax machine, a multi-function peripheral, an electronic document management system, a plotter, a network fax machine, a language translation server and a knowledge management system (see item labeled 31 in figure 1 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

8. Referring to claim 10, Lahey discloses an software application for print processing (see lines 15-31 of column 7). This program is fully capable of being downloaded.

9. Referring to claim 12, Lahey teaches a network document processing system, comprising:

Art Unit: 2182

a) a generic document processing client installed on at least one workstation connected to a network, wherein the document processing client is operable to interact with several different types of document processing devices (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

b) a job file store, operable to receive document data files generated by the document processing client (see lines 31-37 of column 12); and

c) at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of the document data files and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client (see lines 7-18 of column 5).

10. Referring to claim 13, Lahey teaches the document-processing client is one of the group comprised of: a printer client, a fax client, an electronic document management system client, a language translation client, and a knowledge system management client (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

11. Referring to claims 15 and 16, Lahey discloses the job file is located on another device in the network and the job file store is a dedicated device (see lines 31-37 of column 12).

Art Unit: 2182

12. Referring to claims 18 and 19, Lahey discloses generating the document comprises generating a document data file based on the operational settings (see lines 14-17 of column 9).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3,4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,826).

15. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Lahey fails to teach activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing device.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing

Art Unit: 2182

device, wherein the user interface is a web page (see lines 29-37 of column 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to access the desired information with any computer with access to the internet.

16. Referring to claim 7, Lahey teaches the auxiliary information includes the operational settings specified by the user (see lines 25-27 of column 6), however Lahey fails to explicitly set forth the limitation that the auxiliary information includes the size of the file.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, the auxiliary information including the size of the file (see lines 20-25 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to select files to be



Art Unit: 2182

printed based on the files attribute information as suggested by Yokoyama (see lines 26-37 of column 3).

17. Claims 6,11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,816).

18. Referring to claim 6, Lahey fails to teach communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device.

Shima teaches, in an analogous system, communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device (see lines 19-40 of column 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order for the printer to be able to print documents from any computer with access to the internet.

Art Unit: 2182

19. Referring to claim 11, Lahey fails to teach the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network.

Shima teaches the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the computer-readable medium of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima in order for to allow for each computer on the network to print to the network printer.

20. Referring to claim 14, Lahey fails to teach the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client.

Shima teaches the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in

Art Unit: 2182

order for documents on the workstations hard disk can be printed.

***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

1) The prior art of record fails to teach the newly added limitations of activating an interface between a workstation and a document processing device by locating the predetermined document processing device and accessing an operation setting of the predetermined document processing device as required by claim 1 (see second full paragraph of page 7 of applicants remarks, similar arguments are reiterated at the second full paragraph of page 11, and the third full paragraph of page 12).

2) The prior art does not teach a document processing client... operable to interact with **several** different types of document processing devices (emphasis in applicant's reply).

**As per argument 1, the Examiner disagrees.** Lahey teaches locating a predetermined document processing device (see lines 35-47 of column 8). Lahey teaches the activated a drop down menu, can locate a desired printer from that list and select it,

Art Unit: 2182

then select the operational settings such as selecting the page layout, alignment, single-sided/double sided etc.

As per argument 2, the Examiner disagrees. Lahey teaches the document processing client is operable to interact with several different types of devices (see at least figure 5a wherein Lahey illustrates several different types of printers). The document processing client interacts, via the server, with each of the devices by being able to select different operation settings (listed supra) for printing. There is no limitation in the claim requiring a direct connection between the workstation running the client and the document processing devices.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J. Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2182

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EJS  
August 31, 2005



**KIM HUYNH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

9/1/05